

2005-28

>>> William Kent <[wkentiii@yahoo.com](mailto:wkentiii@yahoo.com)> 9/23/2005 5:30 PM >>>

I oppose the proposed amendment.

First, it seems to me that for the Supreme Court to allow itself to be deprived of the authority to appoint the deputy administrator would be to abrogate its responsibility to supervise the Attorney Grievance Commission. It is equally important for the court to appoint the deputy who would serve in the absence of the appointed administrator as it is to appoint the administrator him/herself.

Second, I note that although the staff comment doesn't mention it, the amendment to Rule 9.109(A) deletes the requirement for the deputy administrator to be an attorney. This is offensive because the proposed amendment seems to assume that while it is important that the administrator be an attorney who has an understanding of the unique nature of our profession, it is not important that the deputy who would assist the administrator and serve in the absence of the administrator be similarly qualified. I respectfully disagree with such an assumption.

I suggest that the Court decline to adopt the proposed amendment.

W. Wallace Kent, Jr., P15902  
Tuscola County Probate Judge